

28th February 1928]

- (b) The Pykara scheme as now proposed will not extend as far as the Tanjore district in the first instance.
- (c) This will be a question for future consideration.
- (d) The Government do not know.
- (e) The Government are not prepared to comply with the request.

Mr. C. GOPALA MENON :—“ May I know what the objection of the Government is for placing on the table of this House the report of the special officer in connexion with the hydro-electric schemes ? ”

The hon. Sir C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ It contains only tentative conclusions.”

\* Mr. C. GOPALA MENON :—“ Cannot that be placed for the information of the hon. Members of this House ? ”

The hon. Sir C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ When a final resume of all investigations is placed on the table of the House, the question will be considered.”

### Irrigation

*Maintenance of main channels under the Cuddapah-Kurnool canal.*

\* 1618 Q.—Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state in reference to the answer given to question No. 524 on 18th October 1927 regarding the maintenance of main channels under the Cuddapah-Kurnool canal—

- (a) whether the report referred to therein has been received ;
- (b) if so, what it is ; and
- (c) what action the Government propose to take thereon ?

A—(a) Yes.

(b) The gist of the report is as follows :—

The channel issuing from sluice No. 26 of the Kurnool-Cuddapah canal irrigates about 150 acres. Ryots in the higher reaches cut open the left bank and irrigate their fields. So, lands at the tail-end, including Medam Venkayya's, suffer.

The channel is merely a water-course and repairs to it should be done by the ryots themselves, as Government do not usually undertake the maintenance of such distributaries. A distributary channel branching off from the channel in question was in fact repaired before at the cost of the Government, but that was not in accordance with accepted policy.

The delay in passing orders on Medam Venkayya's petition is explained by the Collector thus :—

Venkayya petitioned the Collector in March 1926, but the question of the repairs to sluices had been under correspondence between the Collector and the Executive Engineer for some time previously. The Collector had inspected the sluices in question even before the receipt of Venkayya's petition and in consultation with the Executive Engineer arrived at what they considered might be adopted as a working policy in this particular case requiring the ryots to pay a fair contribution. The Collector

[28th February 1928]

put his proposal to the ryots at the jamabandi in April 1926, and the ryots agreed to submit a written statement showing how far they would contribute. But they have so far not done so. In December 1926, the Executive Engineer prepared an estimate for Rs. 250 (masonry Rs. 150 and earthwork Rs. 100) for repairs to the sluice in question but as the ryots were not prepared to contribute anything, the matter was dropped.

(c) The question of prohibiting the system of irrigation by open cuts in the upper reaches of the channel has been referred again to the Board.

*Repairs to the supply channel in Kurnool district.*

\* 1619 Q.—Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state in regard to the reply given to question No. 938 answered on 31st October 1927, regarding the repairs to the supply channel in Kurnool district, whether the reports of the Revenue Board and the Chief Engineer referred to therein as exhibiting some discrepancy and as having been referred back have been received and if so, what they are?

A.—The further report called for has not been received.

*Repairs to sluice No. 4 of the Nandyal tank.*

\* 1620 Q.—Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state in reference to the replies given to question No. 831 (answered on 22nd October 1927) regarding repairs to sluice No. 4 of the Nandyal tank—

(a) during what year or years between 1928 and 1927 the Nandyal tank was not dry and whether it is not true that at sluice No. 4 and for a long way into the basin the tank is most often dry;

(b) whether at the inspection of the Executive Engineer on the 24th of May 1927, he intimated the Irrigation Panchayat of the bad condition of the sluice; if not, when he communicated with the Irrigation Panchayat for the first time in this matter;

(c) whether, until the moment it was felt necessary to open the bund, none had examined in what condition the sluice was;

(d) whether, ordinarily, rains do not commence in the month of June in the Kurnool district;

(e) who collected the workmen that made up the ring-bund by the evening and from what villages;

(f) when the connecting channel from sluice No. 3 along the toe of the bund was finished and water let through it for irrigation purposes, and

(g) what was the discharge (average) through or into this channel?

A.—The Government have called for a report.